UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/529,405	03/29/2005	Christian Scheering	2003P00251WOUS	1353	
Siemens Corpor	7590 11/19/200 ration	EXAMINER			
Intellectual Prop	perty Department		PARK, JEONG S		
170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•		2454			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/19/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/529,405	SCHEERING, CHRISTIAN	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	JEONG S. PARK	2454	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 October 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		-	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi real (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection E FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NO¯ w);	ΓE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	ected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	scied ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		-	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>17, 18, 20, 26-28, 30, 31 and 33-47</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8.	hofore or on the date of filing a No	ation of Appeal will not	ha antarad
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See continuation sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Joseph E. Avellino/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2446	

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to argument on Golla's broadcasting, Golla teaches as follows:

Network device transmits a trivial FTP (TFTP) broadcast to possible multiple TFTP servers and one of TFTP server responds back a file contains information about the closest LDAP serer (see, e.g., col. 6, lines 23-30).

Therefore, Golla teaches transmitting a request and receiving a response as applicant claimed.

When Golla's system is modified with one server including all three servers (DHCP, DNS and TFTP servers) in order to efficiently centralize multiple functionalities together. It would obvious for the network device to transmit TFTP message to one dedicated multi-functional server.

In response to argument on device domain name input, Golla teaches as follows:

Network device resolve its hostname (equivalent to applicant's device domain name because the hostname includes the device domain name also) automatically with DNS server (240 in figure 2A)(see, e.g., col. 6, lines 16-22).

Therefore, Golla resolves the same problem automatically instead of manually inputting device domain name.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Golla to include manual device domain name input by an administrator in order to reduce system cost for DNS server.

In response to the provisional nonstatutory double patenting rejection, the terminal disclaimer filed on 10/27/2008 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of copending Application No. 10/884,485 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.